UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,744	11/09/2001	Robert Sesek	10012542-1	7359
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400			EXAMINER	
			GREENE, DANIEL LAWSON	
Fort Collins, CO	· -		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3694	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/037,744	SESEK, ROBERT	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DANIEL L. GREENE	3694	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY OF THE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY OF THE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY OF THE MONTH OF THE M	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10. This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ The 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4)	<u>27,28,33 and 34</u> is/are withdrawn fr 3 <u>2 and 35-42</u> is/are rejected.	om consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	oor		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according to a deposition of the examination	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bures * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/037,744 Page 2

Art Unit: 3694

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Applicant's election without traverse of species 1a, 2a, and 3a in the reply filed on 1/10/2008 is acknowledged.
- 2. Claims 4, 5, 8, 14, 18, 19, 22, 27, 28, 33 and 34 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 1/10/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-13, 15-17, 20, 21, 23-26, 29-32, and 35-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims are directed to a judicial exception; as such, pursuant to the Interim Guidelines on Patent Eligible Subject Matter (MPEP 2106)), the claims must have either physical transformation and/or a useful, concrete and tangible result. The claims fail to include transformation from one physical state to another. Although, the claims appear useful and concrete, there does not appear to be a tangible result claimed. Merely providing print content and compensation content would not appear to be sufficient to constitute a tangible result, since the outcome of the compensation step has not been used in a disclosed practical application nor made available in such a manner that its

usefulness in a disclosed practical application can be realized. As such, the subject matter of the claims is not patent eligible.

The independent claims recite a series of steps and are considered for the purpose of analysis under 35 U.S.C. 101 as merely reciting a series of steps. The claims do not recite a "pre" or "post" computer activity but merely disclose a series of steps of providing compensation that does not explicitly require a computer to perform, per se.

A process is statutory if it requires physical acts to be performed outside of the computer independent of and following the steps performed by a programmed computer, where those acts involve the manipulation of tangible physical objects and result in the object having a different physical attribute or structure (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8).

Furthermore, in determining whether the claimed subject matter is statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101, a practical application test should be conducted to determine whether a "useful, concrete and tangible result" is accomplished. See *AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc.*, 172 F.3d 1352, 1359-60, 50 USPQ2d 1447, 1452-53 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.*, 149 F.3d 1368, 1373, 47 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

An invention, which is eligible for patenting under 35 U.S.C. 101, is in the "useful arts" when it is a machine, manufacture, process or composition of matter, which produces a concrete, tangible, and useful result. The fundamental test for patent eligibility is thus to determine whether the claimed invention produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result". The test for practical application as applied by the examiner

Application/Control Number: 10/037,744

Art Unit: 3694

involves the determination of the following factors"

(a) "Useful" - The Supreme Court in *Diamond v. Diehr* requires that the examiner look at the claimed invention as a whole and compare any asserted utility with the claimed invention to determine whether the asserted utility is accomplished.

Page 4

Applying utility case law the examiner will note that:

- i. the utility need not be expressly recited in the claims, rather it may be inferred.
- ii. if the utility is not asserted in the written description, then it must be well established.
- (b) "Tangible" Applying *In re Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d 1354, 31 USPQ2d 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1994), the examiner will determine whether there is simply a mathematical construct claimed, such as a disembodied data structure and method of making it. If so, the claim involves no more than a manipulation of an abstract idea and therefore, is nonstatutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. In *Warmerdam* the abstract idea of a data structure became capable of producing a useful result when it was fixed in a tangible medium, which enabled its functionality to be realized.
- (c) "Concrete" Another consideration is whether the invention produces a "concrete" result. Usually, this question arises when a result cannot be assured.

The claims must be drafted to ensure the use of a computer is undeniable in the process of the invention. To allow for the method to be performed without requiring a computer to do so, falls outside of the prerequisites of 35 U.S.C. 101.

"In order for a method to be considered a "process" under §101, a claimed process must either: (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular

Application/Control Number: 10/037,744 Page 5

Art Unit: 3694

apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials). *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972). If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under §101 and is non-statutory subject matter."

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL L. GREENE whose telephone number is (571)272-6876. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on (571) 272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. L. G./ Examiner, Art Unit 3694 2008-09-12

/James P Trammell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3694